

THE CATLIN MULTITYPE AND BIHOLOMORPHIC EQUIVALENCE OF MODELS

MARTIN KOLÁŘ

ABSTRACT. We consider an alternative approach to a fundamental CR invariant – the Catlin multitype. It is applied to a general smooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, not necessarily pseudoconvex. Using this approach, we prove biholomorphic equivalence of models, and give an explicit description of biholomorphisms between different models. A constructive finite algorithm for computing the multitype is described. The results can be viewed as providing a necessary step in understanding local biholomorphic equivalence of Levi degenerate hypersurfaces of finite Catlin multitype.

1. INTRODUCTION

The subject of this paper is local biholomorphic geometry of Levi-degenerate hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, and a fundamental CR invariant – the Catlin multitype. We consider a constructive approach, which allows to understand the local equivalence problem on the level of weighted homogeneous models.

The problem of local biholomorphic equivalence for real hypersurfaces in complex space has a long history (we refer to the survey articles [1], [17] for a historical account). In recent years, the problem has been intensively studied on Levi degenerate manifolds, mostly using the extrinsic approach of Poincaré and Moser. In fact, a result of [11] indicates that the intrinsic approach of Cartan, Chern and Tanaka is in general not available in the degenerate setting.

We start by reviewing some motivating facts from complex dimension two. The lowest order CR invariant of a smooth hypersurface $M \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$ at a point $p \in M$ is the type of the point, introduced by J. J. Kohn in his pioneering work [12]. The type is an integer measuring the maximal order of contact between M and complex curves passing through p . In terms of coordinates, the point is of finite type k if and only if there exist local holomorphic coordinates (z, w) such that the defining equation for M takes form

$$(1) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = P(z, \bar{z}) + o(\operatorname{Re} w, |z|^k),$$

where P is a nonzero homogeneous polynomial of degree k without harmonic terms. The manifold $Im\ w = P(z, \bar{z})$ is the model hypersurface at p . Here P is determined uniquely up to linear transformations in the complex tangential variable z , and one immediately obtains important invariants from the coefficients of P (see e.g. [13], [14]).

To study higher order invariants, consider a biholomorphic transformation

$$(2) \quad w^* = g(z, w), \quad z^* = f(z, w),$$

which preserves the local description (1). The main tool for analyzing the action of (2) on the defining equation of M is the generalized Chern-Moser operator

$$(3) \quad L(f, g) = \operatorname{Re} \left\{ ig(z, Re\ w + iP(z, \bar{z})) + 2 \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} f(z, Re\ w + iP(z, \bar{z})) \right\},$$

whose existence is a fundamental consequences of the finite type condition. Examining the kernel and image of L one can construct a complete set of local invariants ([14]).

In higher dimensions, local geometry of Levi degenerate hypersurfaces is far more complicated, even on the initial level. Invariants relevant for analysis of the inhomogeneous Cauchy-Riemann equations are now obtained by considering orders of contact with singular complex varieties. If d_k denotes the maximal order of contact of M with complex varieties of dimension k at p , the n -tuple $(d_n, \dots, d_1)$ is called the D'Angelo multitype of M at p ([7]).

For pseudoconvex hypersurfaces, D. Catlin ([4]) introduced a different notion of multitype, using a more algebraic approach. The entries of the Catlin multitype take rational values, but need not be integers, anymore. This approach provides a defining equation analogous to (1), and a well defined weighted-homogeneous model, an essential tool for local analysis (see e.g. [9], [10]).

There is a class of hypersurfaces on which the two multitypes coincide (termed semiregular [8], or h-extendible [18]), but in the most interesting instances, the two multitypes are not equal.

In this paper we use Catlin's definition of multitype for a general smooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. The definition itself is nonconstructive, and the corresponding models are not uniquely defined. In order to study higher order CR invariants it becomes essential to understand the non-uniqueness in the definition of models. In particular, it is not a priori clear if all models have to be biholomorphically equivalent (for

pseudoconvex h -extendible hypersurfaces this problem was considered in [16]).

Hypersurfaces of finite Catlin multitype provide the natural class of manifolds for which a generalization of the Chern-Moser operator is well defined.

We denote again by P the leading weighted homogeneous polynomial determined by Catlin's construction, and consider a biholomorphic transformation

$$(4) \quad w^* = w + g(z, w), \quad z_i^* = z_i + f_i(z, w).$$

The operator now takes form

$$(5) \quad L(f, g) = \operatorname{Re} \left\{ ig(z, \operatorname{Re} w + iP(z, \bar{z})) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_j} f_j(z, \operatorname{Re} w + iP(z, \bar{z})) \right\}.$$

The first necessary step in understanding this operator is to consider the strictly subhomogeneous level, in the sense of Definition 2.3 below. Our results imply, in particular, that the kernel of L is always trivial on this level. Analysis of the kernel and image of L , and applications to the local equivalence problem is the subject of a forthcoming article.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define the Catlin multitype of a general smooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$. This leads to distinguished weighted coordinate systems. Then we consider the associated weighted homogeneous transformations, and define their subhomogeneous and superhomogeneous analogs. In Section 3 we analyze model hypersurfaces, and define a normalization, which is used in an essential way in the following section.

Section 4 considers the biholomorphic equivalence problem for models. We prove that all models at a given point are biholomorphically equivalent, by explicitly described polynomial transformations. Using this result we give in Section 5 a constructive finite algorithm for computing the multitype.

2. HYPERSURFACES OF FINITE MULTITYPE

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a smooth hypersurface (not necessarily pseudoconvex), and p be a Levi degenerate point on M . We will assume that p is a point of finite type in the sense of Bloom and Graham. Throughout the paper, the standard multiindex notation will be used.

Let (z, w) be local holomorphic coordinates centered at p , where $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ and $z_j = x_j + iy_j$, $w = u + iv$. The hyperplane

$\{v = 0\}$ is assumed to be tangent to M at p . We describe M near p as the graph of a uniquely determined real valued function

$$(6) \quad v = \Psi(z_1, \dots, z_n, \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_n, u).$$

The definition of multitype is based on weighted coordinate systems. Roughly speaking, the weights measure the order of vanishing of a suitably chosen defining function in each of the variables. As the first step, the weights of the complex nontangential variables w , u and v are set equal to one. Then we consider the complex tangential variables.

Definition 2.1. *A weight is an n -tuple of nonnegative rational numbers $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, where $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and $\lambda_j \geq \lambda_{j+1}$, such that for each k either $\lambda_k = 0$, or there exist nonnegative integers $a_1, \dots, a_k$ satisfying $a_k > 0$ and*

$$\sum_{j=1}^k a_j \lambda_j = 1.$$

If Λ is a weight, the weighted degree of a monomial $c_{\alpha\beta l} z^\alpha \bar{z}^\beta u^l$ is defined to be

$$l + \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_i + \beta_i) \lambda_i.$$

A polynomial $P(z, \bar{z}, u)$ is Λ -homogeneous of weighted degree κ if it is a sum of monomials of weighted degree κ .

The weighted length of a multiindex $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is defined by

$$|\alpha|_\Lambda = \lambda_1 \alpha_1 + \dots + \lambda_n \alpha_n.$$

Similarly, if $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_n)$ are two multiindices, the weighted length of the pair $(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})$ is

$$|(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})|_\Lambda = \lambda_1 (\alpha_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1) + \dots + \lambda_n (\alpha_n + \hat{\alpha}_n).$$

The weighted order of a differential operator $\frac{\partial^{|\alpha+\hat{\alpha}|+l}}{\partial z^\alpha \partial \bar{z}^{\hat{\alpha}} \partial u^l}$ is equal to $l + |(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})|_\Lambda$.

A weight Λ will be called distinguished if there exist local holomorphic coordinates (z, w) in which the defining equation of M takes form

$$(7) \quad v = P(z, \bar{z}) + o_\Lambda(1),$$

where $P(z, \bar{z})$ is a nonzero Λ -homogeneous polynomial of weighted degree one without pluriharmonic terms, and $o_\Lambda(1)$ denotes a smooth

function whose derivatives of weighted order less than or equal to one vanish.

The fact that distinguished weights do exist follows from the assumption of Bloom-Graham finite type ([2]).

Definition 2.2. *Let $\Lambda_M = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ be the infimum of distinguished weights with respect to the lexicographic ordering. The multitype of M at p is defined to be the n -tuple $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$, where $m_j = \frac{1}{\mu_j}$ if $\mu_j \neq 0$ and $m_j = \infty$ if $\mu_j = 0$. If none of the m_j is infinity, we say that M is of finite multitype at p .*

Note that since the definition of multitype considers all distinguished weights, the infimum is a biholomorphic invariant, and we may speak of *the* multitype.

Coordinates corresponding to a distinguished weight Λ , in which the local description of M has form (7), with P being Λ -homogeneous, will be called Λ -adapted.

Λ_M will be called the multitype weight, and Λ_M -adapted coordinates will be also referred to as multitype coordinates.

It is easy to verify that for any $\delta > 0$ there are only finitely many possible rational values for any weight entry, satisfying $\lambda_i > \delta$. It follows that if M is of finite multitype at p , Λ_M -adapted coordinates do exist.

From now on we assume that $p \in M$ is a point of finite multitype.

Let t denote the number of different entries appearing in the multitype weight, and $\nu_j, j = 1, \dots, t$, be the length of the j -th constant piece of the multitype weight. Hence, denoting $k_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \nu_i$, we have

$$\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_{k_1} > \mu_{k_1+1} = \dots = \mu_{k_2} > \dots = \mu_{k_{t-1}} > \mu_{k_{t-1}+1} = \dots = \mu_n.$$

We define a 'generating' sequence of weights $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_t$ as follows. Λ_1 is the constant n -tuple $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)$ and $\Lambda_t = \Lambda_M$ is the multitype weight. For $1 < j < t$, the weight $\Lambda_j = (\lambda_1^j, \dots, \lambda_n^j)$ is defined by $\lambda_i^j = \mu_i$ for $i \leq k_{j-1}$, and $\lambda_i^j = \mu_{k_{j-1}+1}$ for $i > k_{j-1}$.

If (7) is the defining equation in some multitype coordinates, we define a model hypersurface associated to M at p as

$$(8) \quad M_H = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \mid v = P(z, \bar{z})\}.$$

In order to analyse biholomorphisms between models, we will use the following terminology.

Definition 2.3. *Let $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ be a weight. A transformation*

$$w^* = w + g(z_1, \dots, z_n, w), \quad z_i^* = z_i + f_i(z_1, \dots, z_n, w)$$

preserving form (6) is called

- Λ -homogeneous if f_i is a Λ -homogeneous polynomial of weighted degree λ_i and g is a Λ -homogeneous polynomial of weighted degree one,
- Λ -subhomogeneous if f_i is a polynomial consisting of monomials of weighted degree less or equal to λ_i and g consists of monomials of weighted degree less or equal to one,
- Λ -superhomogeneous if the Taylor expansion of f_i consists of terms of weighted degree greater or equal to λ_i and g consists of terms of weighted degree greater or equal to one.

Note that we only consider nonsingular transformations (with non-vanishing Jacobian at the origin).

We now fix Λ_M -adapted coordinates, and write the corresponding leading polynomial P as

$$(9) \quad P(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{|(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})|_{\Lambda_M}=1} A_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}} z^\alpha \bar{z}^{\hat{\alpha}}.$$

Let P^k denote the restriction of P to the first k coordinate axes,

$$P^k(z_1, \dots, z_k, \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_k) = P(z_1, \dots, z_k, 0, \dots, 0, \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_k, 0, \dots, 0).$$

It follows from the definition that Λ_M -homogeneous transformations are of the form

$$(10) \quad z_i^* = z_i + \sum_{|\alpha|_{\Lambda_M}=\mu_i} C_\alpha z^\alpha, \quad w^* = cw + \sum_{|\alpha|_{\Lambda_M}=1} D_\alpha z^\alpha$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^*$.

The set of such transformations forms a group, which will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}$. The subgroup of $\mathcal{H}$ consisting of transformations for which $g = 0$ (preserving the w variable) will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}^Z$. Finally, let $\mathcal{L}$ denote the subgroup of $\mathcal{H}^Z$, consisting of all linear transformations in $\mathcal{H}^Z$.

3. A NORMALIZATION OF THE MODEL

We will use the truncated leading polynomial P^k , $k = 1, \dots, n$, to define a normalization condition corresponding to Λ_M -homogeneous changes in the z_k variable.

Definition 3.1. *Multitype coordinates (z, w) are called regular, if for*

each $k = 1, \dots, n$,

$$(11) \quad \frac{\partial P^k}{\partial z_k}(z_1, \dots, z_k, \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_k)$$

is not identically zero.

The following lemma shows that regular coordinates do exist, and are in fact generic among multitype coordinates.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (z, w) be multitype coordinates. Then there exists a transformation $H \in \mathcal{H}^Z$, such that the new coordinates are regular.*

Proof: The proof is by induction. We will assume that $\frac{\partial P^j}{\partial z_j}$ is not identically zero for all $j < k$, and find transformations which preserve this and attain the condition for P^k .

Let k' be the largest index such that $\mu_k = \mu_{k'}$. Clearly, $P^{k'}$ has to depend on z_k , otherwise we could lower the weight of z_k and obtain a lexicographically smaller distinguished weight, contradicting the definition of Λ_M . Pick any monomial in $P^{k'}$ containing z_k , say

$$A_{\beta, \hat{\beta}} z^\beta \bar{z}^{\hat{\beta}},$$

where $A_{\beta, \hat{\beta}} \neq 0$, and $(\beta, \hat{\beta})$ satisfies $\beta_j = \hat{\beta}_j = 0$ for $j > k'$, and $\beta_k + \hat{\beta}_k \neq 0$. Consider all terms in $P^{k'}$ with the same initial part in the variables $z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}$,

$$\left(\prod_{j < k} z_j^{\beta_j} \bar{z}_j^{\hat{\beta}_j} \right) Q(z_k, \dots, z_{k'}, \bar{z}_k, \dots, \bar{z}_{k'}).$$

Clearly, for a generic linear transformation of the variables $z_k, \dots, z_{k'}$, in the new coordinates the corresponding homogeneous polynomial Q^* does not vanish on the z_k axis. It follows that the restriction of P^* to $z_{k+1} = \dots = z_n = 0$ depends on z_k . This finishes the proof.

The following definition singles out a leading term in P for each of the variables.

Definition 3.2. *Let (z, w) be regular coordinates. The leading term in the variable z_k is given by the lexicographically smallest multiindex pair $\Gamma^k = (\gamma^k, \hat{\gamma}^k)$, such that*

$$(12) \quad \gamma_j^k = \hat{\gamma}_j^k = 0 \quad \text{for } j = k+1, \dots, n,$$

$$(13) \quad \gamma_k^k + \hat{\gamma}_k^k \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\gamma^k, \hat{\gamma}^k} \neq 0.$$

The leading terms are used to define a normalization of P .

Definition 3.3. *Let (z, w) be regular coordinates. We say that the leading polynomial P , given by (9), is normalized if for every k*

$$(i) \quad A_{\gamma^k, \hat{\gamma}^k} = 1$$

and

$$(ii) \quad A_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}} = 0$$

for any multiindex pair $(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})$ such that $\alpha = \gamma^k$, $\hat{\alpha}_j = \hat{\gamma}_j^k$ for $j < k$, $\hat{\alpha}_k = \gamma_k^k - 1$ and $|\hat{\alpha}|_{\Lambda_M} = |\hat{\gamma}^k|_{\Lambda_M}$.

We will denote by ϵ^k the multiindex of length n whose k -th component is equal to one and other components are zero.

It is straightforward to show that the normalization of P can indeed be attained by a Λ_M -homogeneous transformation.

Lemma 3.2. *There exist regular coordinates in which the leading polynomial $P(z, \bar{z})$ is normalized.*

Proof: By induction. Let us assume that we have found regular coordinates such that (i) and (ii) are satisfied for all Γ^j with $j < k$ (note that Γ^j are determined by the coordinates). We will change the variable z_k in such a way that (i) and (ii) is satisfied also for Γ^k . The transformation will be of the form

$$(14) \quad z_k = \sum_{|\alpha|_{\Lambda_M} = \mu_k} C_\alpha (z^*)^\alpha, \quad z_j = z_j^* \text{ for } j \neq k,$$

where $C_\alpha \neq 0$ implies $\alpha_j = 0$ for $j < k$. Substituting into $v = P(z, \bar{z})$, we determine the coefficients which attain the normalization condition for k . This gives

$$C_\alpha = -A_{\gamma^k, \hat{\gamma}^k - \epsilon^k + \alpha} + \dots,$$

for $\alpha \neq \epsilon^k$. The condition $A_{\gamma^k, \hat{\gamma}^k} = 1$ is attained by taking C_{ϵ^k} as a solution to

$$A_{\gamma^k, \hat{\gamma}^k} (C_{\epsilon^k})^{\gamma_k^k} (\bar{C}_{\epsilon^k})^{\hat{\gamma}_k^k} = 1.$$

That finishes the proof.

4. BIHOLOMORPHIC EQUIVALENCE OF MODELS

In this section we consider the local equivalence problem for models. We start by showing that a transformation preserves form (7) if and only if it is superhomogeneous.

Theorem 4.1. *A biholomorphic transformation takes Λ_M -adapted coordinates into Λ_M -adapted coordinates if and only if it is Λ_M -superhomogeneous.*

Proof. We first prove the only if part of the statement. Consider a transformation

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} z^* &= z + f(z, w) \\ w^* &= w + g(z, w), \end{aligned}$$

which takes Λ_M -adapted coordinates (z, w) into Λ_M -adapted coordinates (z^*, w^*) .

Let $v^* = F^*(z^*, \bar{z}^*, u^*)$ be the defining equation of M in the new coordinates. Substituting (15) into $v^* = F^*(z^*, \bar{z}^*, u^*)$ we obtain the transformation formula

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} &F^*(z + f(z, u + iF(z, \bar{z}, u)), \overline{z + f(z, u + iF(z, \bar{z}, u))}, u + \\ &+ \operatorname{Re} g(z, u + iF(z, \bar{z}, u)) = F(z, \bar{z}, u) + \operatorname{Im} g(z, u + iF(z, \bar{z}, u)). \end{aligned}$$

Without any loss of generality, we may assume that P is normalized (applying a Λ_M -homogeneous transformation in the source space, if necessary). On the other hand, we do not assume that P^* is normalized. Instead, in the target space we use an element of $\mathcal{L}$ to normalize the linear part of the transformation and assume that the Jacobi matrix of the transformation at the origin is the unit matrix.

By induction we will show that the transformation has to be superhomogeneous with respect to all weights in the generating sequence $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_t$.

For $l = 1$, we have $\Lambda_1 = (m_1, \dots, m_1)$. Hence Λ_1 -homogeneous transformations in $\mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ are linear, and the claim is obvious.

Let $l > 1$ and assume the transformation is Λ_j -superhomogeneous for all j with $j < l$. We will prove that it is also Λ_l -superhomogeneous. Note that $\lambda_j^l < \lambda_j^{l-1}$ if and only if $j > k_{l-1}$.

We separate the strictly subhomogeneous part (with respect to Λ_l) of the inverse transformation, and write

$$(17) \quad z_i = z_i^* + \sum_{|\alpha|_{\Lambda_l} < \lambda_i^l} C_\alpha^i (z^*)^\alpha + O_{\Lambda_l}(\lambda_i^l).$$

Note that $w = w^* + o_{\Lambda_l}(1)$, since P and P^* contain no pluriharmonic terms. In this notation, let

$$\Theta = \{(i, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}; C_\alpha^i \neq 0\}.$$

The elements of Θ have the following immediate properties. If $(i, \alpha) \in \Theta$, then $\alpha_j = 0$ for $j \leq i$, since $\lambda_j^l \geq \lambda_i^l$. Further, by Λ_{l-1} -superhomogeneity,

each of the terms appearing in (17) must contain at least one of the variables $z_{k_{l-1}+1}, \dots, z_n$. We denote

$$S(\alpha) = \alpha_{k_{l-1}+1} + \dots + \alpha_n.$$

Hence $S(\alpha) > 0$ for all $(i, \alpha) \in \Theta$.

Analogous notation will be also used for multiindex pairs:

$$S(\alpha, \hat{\alpha}) = \alpha_{k_{l-1}+1} + \dots + \alpha_n + \hat{\alpha}_{k_{l-1}+1} + \dots + \hat{\alpha}_n.$$

Let m_S be the minimal value of $S(\alpha)$ as (i, α) ranges over Θ . For $(i, \alpha) \in \Theta$ consider the "gap"

$$G(i, \alpha) = \lambda_i^l - \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \lambda_j^l.$$

Among all pairs (i, α) in Θ for which $S(\alpha) = m_S$, let Ξ denote the set of those for which $G(i, \alpha)$ is maximal. Next, let m be the smallest integer such that $(m, \alpha) \in \Xi$ for some α . Now we fix one such pair, $(m, \delta) \in \Xi$ and consider the corresponding monomial in 17:

$$C_{(0, \dots, 0, \delta_{m+1}, \dots, \delta_n)}^m \prod_{j>m} (z_j^*)^{\delta_j},$$

where $\delta = (0, \dots, 0, \delta_{m+1}, \dots, \delta_n)$. Note that $m \leq k_{l-1}$.

Substituting (17) into

$$v = \sum_{|(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})|_{\Lambda_l} = 1} A_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}} z^\alpha \bar{z}^{\hat{\alpha}} + o_{\Lambda_l}(1),$$

we compute the coefficient of

$$(18) \quad (z^*)^{\gamma^m} (\bar{z}^*)^{\hat{\gamma}^m - \epsilon^m + \delta}.$$

Since F starts with weight one, it is enough to consider the strictly subhomogeneous part of the transformation. Hence we need to consider the expansion of

$$F(z_1^* + \sum_{|\alpha|_{\Lambda_l} < \lambda_1^l} C_\alpha^1 (z^*)^\alpha, \dots, z_n^* + \sum_{|\alpha|_{\Lambda_l} < \lambda_n^l} C_\alpha^m (z^*)^\alpha, \overline{z_1^* + \dots}, 0)$$

First, consider terms coming from the leading polynomial. If for some multiindex pair $(\beta, \hat{\beta})$ the coefficient $A_{\beta, \hat{\beta}}$ enters the equation for (18), then by the choice of (m, δ) there exists a multiindex α and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$\hat{\gamma}^m - \epsilon^m + \delta = \hat{\beta} - \epsilon^j + \alpha,$$

and $\beta = \gamma^m$. But, again by the choice of (m, δ) , the gaps satisfy

$$|\delta - \epsilon^m|_{\Lambda_l} = |\alpha - \epsilon^j|_{\Lambda_l},$$

so

$$|\hat{\gamma}^m|_{\Lambda_l} = |\hat{\beta}|_{\Lambda_l}.$$

Moreover, $\hat{\gamma}_j^m = \hat{\beta}_j$ for all $j < m$, which gives contradiction with the normalization of P . Note that

$$\gamma^m - \epsilon_m = \beta - \epsilon_j$$

is impossible, since it forces $\lambda_j = \lambda_m$, which contradicts the linear part of the transformation being the identity.

It remains to prove that terms of weight greater than one in F do not enter the equation for (18). Let $F_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}, l} z^\alpha \bar{z}^{\hat{\alpha}} u^l$ be such a term, where $|(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})|_{\Lambda_M} > 1$. By the choice of (m, δ) , in order to influence a term of weight $1 - G(m, \delta)$ in F^* we have to substitute at least twice a term with the lowest value of $S(\alpha)$, or a term with a higher value of $S(\alpha)$. In both cases the value of $S(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})$ for the resulting term is bigger than

$$m_S = S(\gamma^m - \epsilon^m + \delta, \hat{\gamma}^m).$$

Thus we have proved that a transformation which takes Λ_M -adapted coordinates into Λ_M -adapted coordinates is Λ_M -superhomogeneous. The converse follows immediately from (16).

Now we can describe explicitly biholomorphisms between different models.

Theorem 4.2. *Let M_H and $\tilde{M}_H$ be two models for M at p . Then there is a Λ_M -homogeneous transformation which maps M_H to $\tilde{M}_H$. In particular, all models are biholomorphically equivalent by a polynomial transformation. Proof:* By the previous proposition, the coordinates in which M_H is the model are related to those in which $\tilde{M}_H$ is the model by a Λ_M -superhomogeneous transformation. But terms of weight greater than λ_i in f_i influence only terms of weight greater than one in F^* . Hence $\tilde{M}_H$ is obtained by the homogeneous part of this transformation.

5. COMPUTING THE MULTITYPE

Using Theorem 4.1, the process of computing multitype can be described as follows.

In the first step, we consider local holomorphic coordinates in which the leading polynomial in the variables $z, \bar{z}$ contains no pluriharmonic term. The first multitype component m_1 is then equal to the degree of

this polynomial. Hence $m_1 = \frac{1}{\mu_1}$ is equal to the Bloom-Graham type of M at p , and we set $\Lambda_1 = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_1)$.

In the second step, consider all Λ_1 -homogeneous transformations and choose one which makes the leading polynomial P_1 independent of the largest number of variables. Let d_1 denote this number. Permuting variables, if necessary, we can assume that in such coordinates,

$$v = P_1(z_1, \dots, z_{n-d_1}, \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_{n-d_1}) + Q_1(z, \bar{z}) + o(u),$$

where P_1 is Λ_1 -homogeneous of weighted degree one, and Q_1 is $o_{\Lambda_1}(1)$. Since Λ_1 -homogeneous transformations are linear, and using the fact that for any weight Λ which is lexicographically smaller than Λ_1 , Λ -adapted coordinates are also Λ_1 -adapted, it follows that $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_{n-d_1}$ and $\mu_{n-d_1+1} < \mu_1$. Let

$$Q_1(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{|(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})|_{\Lambda_1} > 1} C_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}}^1 z^\alpha \bar{z}^{\hat{\alpha}},$$

and denote

$$\Theta_1 = \{(\alpha, \hat{\alpha}) \mid C_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}}^1 \neq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{n-d_1} \alpha_i + \hat{\alpha}_i < m_1\}.$$

For each $(\beta, \hat{\beta}) \in \Theta_1$ consider the number

$$(19) \quad W_1(\beta, \hat{\beta}) = \frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-d_1} (\beta_i + \hat{\beta}_i) \mu_1}{\sum_{i=n-d_1+1}^n \beta_i + \hat{\beta}_i}.$$

The weight Λ_2 is defined by $\lambda_j^2 = \mu_1$ for $j \leq n - d_1$, and

$$\lambda_j^2 = \max_{(\alpha, \hat{\alpha}) \in \Theta_1} W_1(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})$$

for $j > n - d_1$.

By the definition of Λ_2 , the leading polynomial with respect to Λ_2 in the above coordinates depends on at least $n - d_1 + 1$ variables. This ends the second step.

Now we continue the process. In the j -th step, $j > 2$, we use the coordinates obtained in the previous step, and consider all Λ_{j-1} -homogeneous transformations. We denote by d_{j-1} the largest number of variables which do not appear in the leading polynomial after the transformation, and fix such a coordinate system. It is easy to show, using the same arguments as in Theorem 4.1., that any transformation which takes Λ_{j-1} -adapted coordinates into Λ_{j-1} -adapted coordinates has to be Λ_{j-1} -superhomogeneous. If $d_{j-1} < d_{j-2}$, using this and the fact that for any weight Λ which is lexicographically smaller than Λ_{j-1} ,

Λ -adapted coordinates are also Λ_{j-1} -adapted, it follows that we have determined the $(d_{j-2} - d_{j-1})$ multitype entries

$$\mu_{n-d_{j-2}+1} = \cdots = \mu_{n-d_{j-1}} = \lambda_{n-d_{j-2}+1}^{j-1},$$

and set $\lambda_i^j = \mu_i$ for $i \leq n - d_{j-1}$. To define the remaining entries of Λ_j , we write

$$v = P_{j-1}(z_1, \dots, z_{n-d_{j-1}}, \bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_{n-d_{j-1}}) + Q_{j-1}(z, \bar{z}) + o(u),$$

where P_{j-1} is Λ_{j-1} -homogeneous of weighted degree one, and Q_{j-1} is $o_{\Lambda_{j-1}}(1)$,

$$Q_{j-1}(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{|(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})|_{\Lambda_{j-1}} > 1} C_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}}^{j-1} z^\alpha \bar{z}^{\hat{\alpha}}.$$

Let

$$\Theta_{j-1} = \{(\alpha, \hat{\alpha}) \mid C_{\alpha, \hat{\alpha}}^{j-1} \neq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{n-d_{j-1}} (\alpha_i + \hat{\alpha}_i) \mu_i < 1\}.$$

As before, denote

$$(20) \quad W_{j-1}(\beta, \hat{\beta}) = \frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-d_{j-1}} (\beta_i + \hat{\beta}_i) \mu_i}{\sum_{i=n-d_{j-1}+1}^n \beta_i + \hat{\beta}_i}.$$

The remaining entries of Λ_j are defined by

$$\lambda_i^j = \max_{\alpha \in \Theta} W_{j-1}(\alpha, \hat{\alpha})$$

for $j > n - d_{j-1}$.

If $d_{j-1} = d_{j-2}$, we only use (20) to determine $\lambda_{n-d_{j-1}+1}^j, \dots, \lambda_n^j$. No multitype component is determined at this step.

It is immediate to verify that the process terminates after finitely many steps, and determines all components of the multitype weight.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baouendi, M. S., Ebenfelt, P., Rothschild, L. P., *Local geometric properties of real submanifolds in complex space*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **37** (2000), 309–336.
- [2] Bloom, T., Graham, I., *On "type" conditions for generic real submanifolds of C^n* , Invent. Math. **40** (1977), 217–243.
- [3] Bloom, T., Graham, I. *A geometric characterization of points of type m on real submanifolds of C^n* . J. Differential Geometry **12** (1977), 171–182.
- [4] Catlin, D., *Boundary invariants of pseudoconvex domains*, Ann. Math. **120** (1984), 529–586.
- [5] Catlin, D., *Subelliptic estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains*, Ann. of Math. **126** (1987), 131–191.

- [6] Chern, S. S. and Moser, J., *Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds*, Acta Math. **133** (1974), 219–271.
- [7] D'Angelo, J., *Orders of contact, real hypersurfaces and applications*, Ann. Math. **115** (1982), 615–637.
- [8] Diedrich, K. and Herbort, G., *Pseudoconvex domains of semiregular type* in Contributions to Complex Analysis and Analytic geometry (1994), 127–161.
- [9] Kim, K.-T., Kim, S.-Y., *CR hypersurfaces with a contracting automorphism*, J. Geom. Anal. **18** (2008), 800–834.
- [10] Kim, K.-T., Yoccoz, J.-C., *CR manifolds admitting a CR contraction*, arXiv:0807.0482 (2008).
- [11] Kim, S.-Y., Zaitsev, D., *Equivalence and embedding problems for CR-structures of any codimension*, Topology **44** (2005), p. 557–584.
- [12] Kohn, J. J., *Boundary behaviour of $\bar{\partial}$ on weakly pseudoconvex manifolds of dimension two*, J. Differential Geom. **6** (1972), 523–542.
- [13] Kohn, J. J. and Nirenberg, L., *A pseudoconvex domain not admitting a holomorphic support function*, Math. Ann. **201** (1973), 265–268.
- [14] Kolář, M., *Generalized models and local invariants of Kohn-Nirenberg domains* Math. Z., **259** (2008), 277–286.
- [15] Kolář, M., *Normal forms for hypersurfaces of finite type in $\mathbb{C}^2$* , Math. Res. Lett. **12** (2005), p. 523–542.
- [16] Nikolov, N., *Biholomorphy of the model domains at a semiregular boundary point* C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. **55** (2002), no. 5, 5–8.
- [17] Wells, R. O., Jr., *The Cauchy-Riemann equations and differential geometry*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **6** (1982), 187–199.
- [18] Yu, J., *Multitypes of convex domains*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **41** (1992), no. 3, 837–849.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MASARYK UNIVERSITY,
KOTLÁRSKA 2, 611 37 BRNO
E-mail address: mkolar@math.muni.cz